

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

MATTHEW G. SILVA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTINE GREGOIRE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-5731 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
OBJECTIONS TO ORDER AND  
REQUEST TO NOTE PETITION

This matter has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR3 and MJR4. Before the court is Plaintiff's objection to order and to note petition. (Dkt. # 99). For the reasons stated below, Plaintiff's motion shall be denied as moot.

On January 3, 2007, Plaintiff filed a letter addressed to District Court Judge Robert J. Bryan, which was not served on opposing counsel. In an unrelated Order granting an extension of time, the court advised Plaintiff that it was aware of the letter but that the court would take "no action with regard to it, as the letter was not properly filed as a motion and served on Defendants as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." (Dkt. # 93). In response, Plaintiff filed a motion to recuse the undersigned (Dkt. # 102), which motion was denied. (Dkt. # 112). Plaintiff now asks the court to order the Court Clerk to serve defense counsel with copies of Plaintiff's letter; to join additional parties to this action; to order Defendants to provide Plaintiff with supervised electronic access to state and federal court files in all of his pending cases; and to re-note Dkt.# 92 as a motion for injunctive relief. (*See* Dkt. # 99).

1 In the meantime, however, Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction, and declaration (Dkt.  
2 # 104, 100), along with a praecipe to attach the letter at issue, presumably as an exhibit to his motion for  
3 injunctive relief. (See Dkt. # 105). The docket reflects that all of these materials were properly served on  
4 Defendants, and that the motion is noted for March 2, 2007. The court has not yet ruled on the motion.  
5 Accordingly, Plaintiff's requests for service and re-noting of Dkt. # 92 are denied as moot.

6 Plaintiff is further advised, however, that Plaintiff is responsible for serving opposing counsel with  
7 all pleadings and other filings in this matter. In addition, all motions must be properly filed, served and  
8 noted before they will be considered by the court. Finally, there is no provision in the court rules for  
9 mandating access to the court's electronic filing system. Therefore, whenever a pleading or other  
10 document is filed in paper form for the Clerk's office to scan and upload to CM/ECF, the filer must serve  
11 conventional copies on all parties to the case. This means that Plaintiff must serve all pleadings and  
12 motions in paper form on opposing counsel. The Clerk's office will not serve the documents for you  
13 electronically.

14 Accordingly, Plaintiff's objections and request to renote Dkt. # 92 are **DENIED as moot**. The  
15 Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for Defendants.

16  
17 DATED this 27th day of March, 2007.

18  
19 

20 Karen L. Strombom  
21 United States Magistrate Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28